

REMARKS

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections and objections set forth in the Office Action dated June 5, 2006.

Claim Objections

Claim 27 was objected to because of minor informalities. Applicant has amended Claim 27 to obviate the claim objections. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the claim objection set forth in the previous Office Action.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that Claims 15, 21, and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims Rejections

Claims 1, 8 – 10, 14, 17 – 19, and 22 – 25 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gotoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,424). Claims 2 – 7, 13, 16, 20 and 26 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gotoh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,847,424).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, the pitch of the micro holes is half or less than half of a wavelength of the light incident on the anti-reflective structure. The arrangement recited in Claim 1 increases the antireflective function and also prevents the tone of emitted light from appearing to be colored due to the spectroscopic function of diffracted light.

Gotoh et al. fail to disclose or suggest the pitch of the micro holes is a half or less of a wavelength of the light incident on the anti-reflective structure. Gotoh et al. teach a contrary arrangement. Gotoh et al. teach “disposed between the projections formed in the projection forming section 308a are depressions 308.” (Figure 18; Column 19, Lines 41 – 43). More specifically, Gotoh et al. teach “the pitch between the projection and the depression is about 10 μm .” (Column 21, Lines 56 – 61). Gotoh et al. do not disclose an arrangement or suggest an arrangement that prevents the tone of emitted light from appearing to be colored due to the spectroscopic function of diffracted light. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claim 8 recites, *inter alia*, a feature that is substantially similar to that recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 8 is allowable for substantially the same reasons recited above.

Dependent Claims 2 – 7, 9 – 10, 13, 14, 16, 17 – 19, 20, 22 – 25, and 26 depend from Claims 1 and 8, so are allowable for at least this reason.


New Claims

Claims 28 and 29 have been added. Claims 28 and 29 find support on at least page 11 of the originally filed application. Claims 28 and 29 depend on an allowable base claim, so are allowable for at least this reason. Further features of Claims 28 and 29 are allowable over Gotoh et al. For example, Gotoh et al. fail to disclose the pitch of the micro holes is about 0.10 μm to 0.25 μm as recited in Claims 28 and 29.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200